



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL RÉGIME IN GREECE

(This is a reply to the article, in the May issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, by Constantine Melas.—THE EDITOR.)

By JOANNÉS GENNADIUS

I HAVE devoted some few minutes to the perusal of the singular composition which, after five months' cogitation upon how to pulverize my article on this subject, Mr. Melas has finally produced in the *ADVOCATE* of May. Its perusal has confirmed the verdict of those competent critics who, having already enjoyed reading it, assured me that every effort should be made to encourage Mr. Melas to write more of the same sort, being meanwhile guaranteed that no attempt at contradiction will be allowed to appear, save and except his own selfsame spirited outpourings.

In these circumstances I might well have saved myself the trouble of a counter-reply, were it not that the bold assurance and the assumption of authority with which Mr. Melas proceeds to lay down the law, maintaining the while a magnificent contempt for any need of evidence, may mislead the unwary and the uninformed on Greek affairs. He strings out his dicta, consecutively numbered, as if he were marshaling forth his Boy Scouts, and he proceeds to accuse me (without producing a shred of proof) of an intention to "mislead the readers," of "willful manipulation" of facts, of "misrepresenting the Greek nation," of "consciously concealing the circumstances," of "pure invention," of "manipulated figures," of "carefully avoiding to mention" what was essential, and so on *ad libitum*.

ATTACK ON MR. MELAS' FAIRNESS

A disputant who knows no better than have recourse to such methods, *ipso facto* places himself out of court with those who respect the rules of discussion usual among gentlemen and scholars. Consequently Mr. Melas' regret that "Mr. Gennadius has a very erroneous conception of what Americans and British term fairness and truthfulness" sounds hugely entertaining, coming from such a source. Pray, where and when did Mr. Melas acquire the conception, or the habit, of these virtues? For we shall find him even more grievously wanting in them as we get along; and to pretend, in these circumstances, respect of them provokes laughter when it does not suggest hypocrisy. What, however, he is entirely lacking in is loyalty in discussion; for it is even worse than disloyal to attribute to me what I have neither said nor suggested. Those, however, who have at times endured the ordeal of the parliamentary disquisitions of the member for Jannina will not be surprised to find the same recklessness reproduced in his written lucubrations.

DENIAL OF MR. MELAS' STATEMENT

It is untrue that I "purposely avoided giving the dates of the issues of the *Government Gazette*" in respect to the numbers of dismissed and cashiered public servants and officers of the army and navy. I quoted in a footnote, fairly and without comment, the numbers as

given both by the one and by the other side. Will Mr. Melas be surprised to hear that those numbers are as stated in a report of a national of one of the foreign legations in Athens noted for his impartiality? When, therefore, Mr. Melas ventures to accuse me of "manipulating the figures" he proves himself forgetful of the rules of gentlemanly discussion.

This matter of dismissals, occupying, as it does, a considerable portion of Mr. Melas' dissertation, seem to be a tender point with him, who was retired from the sea service, apparently, in order now to scout the land.

His next defense relates to the "exceptional measures" of repression, which, he admits, "caused unavoidable hardships." These measures, he tells us, were some "dictated," some "necessitated," and he denies none of those stated by me. Thus we have served up afresh the good old excuse of all arbitrary administrations in similar cases, namely, the "raison d'état."

EMPLOYMENT OF GYPARIS

The employment as chief of police of that red-handed murderer, Gyparis, he dismisses with the suggestion that my quotation of the police records is unworthy of trust. This is all he has to say of that enormity. If Mr. Melas had any conception of "the American and British term of fairness and truthfulness," he would have admitted that he cannot gainsay my statement in regard to that scoundrel.

He then proceeds to raise a thick vale of smoke by inditing a catalogue of nine "facts" which I am supposed to have "concealed very studiously." He thereby offers us an example of "prevaricating dialectics." I concealed nothing; the "facts" in question were not within the scope of my article. If I had purposed to discuss minutely every single incident of the deplorable period to which I referred, I would have required the space of two or three entire numbers of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

Then, again, we have the *ex cathedra* edict that Mr. Melas "considers unworthy of serious attention, the attacks made by me upon the ministers of Mr. Venizelos." No one personally acquainted with Mr. Melas and his antecedents (of which more anon) will lay much store by what he considers worthy or unworthy in politics. But I made no "attacks," unless, indeed, Mr. Melas considers the truthful statement of events of public notoriety to be "attacks." I am afraid he does so consider them when personally inconvenient. And his innocent wonderment, how possibly could it be said that the "same man" governed "quite admirably" from 1910 to 1915 and badly from 1917 to 1920, is apparently the measure of his political acumen. But here again he avoids the straight issue, because they were not the same men who formed those two different administrations.

REASONS FOR VENIZELOS' DEFEAT

He repeats the threadbare and absolutely deceptive argument that the reason of the defeat of Mr. Venizelos at the elections of November, 1920, was that the Greek "people were tired of war," yet he fails to explain how it is that immediately after, and ever since then, this same people have waxed more ready to carry on the war, with

even greater zeal and self-sacrifice. This he avoids, but he concludes with the quasi-Delphic aphorism that what had then been got "Mr. Venizelos had gained mostly with his head." I am charitable enough not to believe that it is with his head that Mr. Melas has conceived the remarkable political axiom that if one is not permanently resident in one's own country and is not a party-man, like the member for Jannina, he is disqualified from forming a just appreciation of events in that country. Students of politics will tell Mr. Melas that there is no witness of passing events so untrustworthy as your professional carpetbagger politician, with no wider vision than the interests next his nose; but that a fairly intelligent and conscientious diplomatic servant, stationed abroad and closely following the trend of home affairs, in which he has no axe to grind, is, on the whole, the most impartial and reliable authority.

It is men of the former description who have been the most fatal partisans of M. Venizelos, and Mr. Melas has obliged us with an edifying example by means of his diatribe. I have said in my former article, and I repeat expressly and in all sincerity, that I admire Mr. Venizelos for his brilliant parts and for his foreign policy, which will stand out as one of the most remarkable achievements in modern times. Not only this, but since his retirement he has given evidence of moderation and sagacity such as his turbulent partisans might well have followed with advantage. Yet I regret the choice of the men with whom he surrounded himself and who have been his worst enemies.

MR. GENNADIUS' SERVICE

I am not surprised that Mr. Melas is incapable of conceiving the possibility of this honestly made discrimination. He is a professional party-man. He can, therefore, discover, in a viewpoint differing from his, only motives similar to his own, but aiming at some other object. And thereupon he, poor man, proceeds to attribute to me the worst of motives. "Mr. Gennadius served under Mr. Venizelos and was *dropped* from active service for reasons known to Mr. Gennadius. It appears, therefore, that Mr. Gennadius has entered into active service under King Constantine with a personal grudge against Mr. Venizelos, which is illy concealed by professions of admiration for the foreign policy of the great statesman." I transcribe here verbatim this innuendo that I may the better stigmatize its iniquity. During my half century's public career, I served under every successive premier since 1871; yet I served no party, but only the interest of my country, which I always held as sacred. The successive Greek ministers, with whose parties I never identified myself, knew this well, and they, therefore, trusted and honored me. I had already passed the age limit during the World War, but my government wished me to continue at my post until its conclusion; and thus I was automatically retired after the armistice, in December, 1918. In any ordinary case there would have been nothing more to say; but my government desired to mark by an exceptional measure the value they attached to my long services. They, therefore, obtained the confirmation by the chamber of a special enactment according to me the permanent title

of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the First Class and an extra yearly allowance beyond my earned pension. The First Grand Cross of the Georgian Order was also conferred on me. These honors had never before been bestowed on a Greek diplomatic servant, and the member for Jannina was one of those present in the chamber when those honors were voted. How ventures he now to insinuate that there were other reasons for my retirement, and that some base motive actuated my efforts to make the truth concerning Greek affairs clearly known? It is with disgust I condescend to notice so foul an attack; its author has earned my pity and contempt.

CLAIM ON MR. MELAS' GRATITUDE

I had a right to claim his gratitude, had I not known that such a right often engenders resentment. Years ago I saved him from the threat of a court-martial when he was accused of mutinous conduct toward the captain of the Greek war vessel then repairing in a British dockyard. And more recently he availed himself, without acknowledgment, of all the information I obtained from General Baden-Powell for the organization of the Boy Scouts; for it is on those data, and not on any American model, that that corps was founded in Greece. But there is still hope that he will duly acknowledge his obligations in this respect when, at the same time, he gives an account of the use made of the several thousands of pounds collected for the Boy Scouts at the public dinner in London at which also I assisted.

From all the above it would be venturesome to say to what extent Mr. Melas is in the habit of exercising a sense of accuracy. When, however, he calmly proceeds to affirm that "Mr. Gennadius is well known in Greek diplomatic circles for his unique declarations that hardly any other Greek diplomat except himself was worthy of becoming the collaborator and councilor of Mr. Venizelos"—when Mr. Melas proceeds, in his turgid idiom, to poison the mind of the reader by such insidious suggestions, the most lenient explanation I think of is that, in his superlative self-esteem, he fancies that his former fulsome assurances of respect and admiration would be, if only renewed, more acceptable now than they were of old. But why do the "Greek diplomatic circles" the disservice of coupling them with these bovine antics?

Equally misplaced are his regrets that I should "have become so soon such a warm friend of the throne," and that my "only interest lies in the ablution of the royal policies." My interest lies, as it has always rested, and as my countrymen generally and generously recognize that it has been centered, in maintaining and promoting the welfare of the fatherland, which welfare depends, I am firmly convinced, upon the stability of its institutions, the initial of which is the present dynasty.* This

* The following is from "An unpublished statement made by Mr. Venizelos in December, 1915," as given by Mr. Paxton Hibben in his "Constantine I and the Greek People," page 579:

"Greece is not ready for a republic and may not be ready for centuries. I have never believed a republic suitable as a government for Greece at this epoch of her history. I have frequently told the king that Greece will need his family ar

attitude of mind and conduct is, I admit, widely different from that of the born snob and the professional court shoeblack, who troubles himself with no public interest and is never inconvenienced by a sense of self-respect, but is ready to turn his coat inside out the moment he finds that subservience has ceased to pay. "Ablution" is, no doubt, necessary here.

MR. MELAS' EARLY DAYS

Mr. Melas does not need it. The traditions of his family for a generation and a half were prominently royalist. His late father was proud to be widely known as the late King George's favorite bridge player. Our own excellent Mr. Melas was christened Constantine in proof of the yearning of the family to have the name of the present sovereign re-echo hourly in the home circle; and both he and his brother were never happier than when distinguished in Athens as the playmates of the young princes. Indeed, Mr. Melas, in quitting the naval service in 1913, addressed to King Constantine a famous letter the servility of which could only vie with the classic style of the composition now before me.

But I will not further insist on reminding Mr. Melas of that brilliant courtly past, for I am afraid lest he be scared from continuing to produce in print fresh manifestations of his political sagacity and of his literary genius. This was, as we have seen, the one hope and recommendation of the competent critics referred to at the outset, and I shall do nothing to check their realization.

"DAS DEUTSCHE REICH"

By EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

WHEN, after the Revolution of 1918 in Germany, the smoke had cleared away and it became time to put the house in order once more, one of the questions that engaged the national constitutional assembly was the designation to be given to the new republic. Should it be known officially as *Die deutsche Republik*, or simply as *Deutschland*, or what? The problem was finally settled by leaving intact the old title, *Deutsches Reich*, much to the perplexity and suspicion of the allied world, which had been taught that *Reich* means empire, that an empire involves an emperor, and that consequently this was merely a ruse or at least an indication that Germany had remained an empire in name and was only awaiting more auspicious times to recall its emperor and again become an empire in fact.

Germans, however, strenuously deny these charges, and most of them assert that if they can help it Germany will never become an emperor-governed empire again. How are we, then, to explain the apparent anomaly?

CONVENIENCE AND SENTIMENT

In the first place, the reason for retaining the design-

hundred, perhaps two hundred, years longer. . . . If there were to be a republic, I should be chosen president; but there would be no one in the liberal party to succeed me. Greece would be in the position of Mexico under Porfirio Diaz. That was bad for Mexico and it would be even worse for Greece."

nation *Deutsches Reich* for the republic is merely convenience, with possibly a touch of sentiment. For the name *Reich* has become attached to Germany in some way ever since the time of Charlemagne, and even while the country was not a unified State, as during the greater part of the nineteenth century, the name still lingered in the memory and was a sort of ideal embodied in the yearning for unification, which was finally achieved in 1871. From then on, under the Hohenzollern régime, the title *Deutsches Reich* became official and so closely attached to Germany that the men of 1918 decided to continue it.

So much as to the reasons for its retention. Now for the question whether there is any valid cause to suspect an ulterior or sinister motive in its preservation.

AS TO CAUSE FOR SUSPICION

The word *reich*, etymologically connected with the Latin *regere*, to rule, does not *per se* connote empire at all, but is rather approximated by our English "dominion," "realm," or "commonwealth." The latter term has been used in the good English translation of the new German constitution recently published in the World Peace Foundation's *League of Nations* and in the new book of Brunet, *The New German Constitution*. The German word for empire, in the sense of a State governed by an emperor, is *Kaiserreich*, which brings out clearly the colorless meaning of the word *reich* by itself. Thus, too, a kingdom is a *königreich*, and the corresponding term for the biblical "kingdom of God"—a loose use of "kingdom"—is *das Reich Gottes*.

INACCURACIES IN THE TREATIES

The confusion of *Reich* with *Kaiserreich* in this country has probably been aggravated by the fact that both in the Treaty of Versailles and in the more recent treaty of peace between the United States and Germany the phrase "German Empire" (*Empire Allemand*) is still incorrectly used with reference to present-day Germany. Clémenceau, however, was more accurate in his correspondence with the president of the German peace delegation at Versailles. He used the ingenious phrase *le Reich allemand*, which might very well serve as a suggestion for us, too; for there is no reason why we should not form the habit of calling Germany officially "The German *Reich*." And when *reich* is used as an adjective (e. g., *Reichspräsident*, *Reichsminister*, *Reichsbürger*, etc.) we shall do best by translating it "of the *Reich*" or "national" or simply "German." Thus we can say "president or minister of the *Reich*" or simply "national president or minister," and for *Reichsbürger* "German citizen."

It is to be hoped, in the interest of a better understanding between the nations, that the foregoing will help to clear up misconceptions that have made themselves felt recently in American publications, and that it will serve to prevent in future such newspaper captions as "The Imperial German Republic" (in German translation this would be *die kaiserliche deutsche Republik*), which is just as nonsensical in the German rendering as it is in English.